

Trade in America 16.

A

COOL REPLY

TO A

CALM ADDRESS,

Lately Published by Mr. *John Wesley*;

By T. S.

Open thy Mouth in the Cause of all such as
are appointed to Destruction, *Prov. xxxi. 8.*

L O N D O N:

Printed for the AUTHOR, and sold by
J. PLUMMER, No. 100, *Fenchurch-
Street*; and to be had at No. 100,
Bishopsgate-Street Within. 1775.



COOL REPLY, &c.

SIR,

I have just received your letter of the 14th inst. and in reply to inform you that I have the pleasure to acknowledge the receipt of the same. I am, Sir, very much obliged to you for the trouble you have taken in writing to me, and I am sure that your letter will be found to contain much valuable information. I am, Sir, very much obliged to you for the trouble you have taken in writing to me, and I am sure that your letter will be found to contain much valuable information.





A

COOL REPLY, &c.

S I R,



T is rather surprising, that a man of your profession, at the age of three score and ten, should enter the list of political controversy.—To be sure you must think, that you was the man, and wisdom would die with you, and that you could not leave the world with a good conscience, without communicating to

A 2

the

the publick, by way of Address, your political sentiments, respecting the present contest between Great-Britain and her Colonies, hoping, no doubt, by your extensive knowledge and piety, you might be happily instrumental in bringing the Colonists to a sense of their duty, and by this means forward a much wished-for reconciliation between them.

If this, Sir, was not the motive which induced you to publish a late Address, it seems natural to conclude, though you have denied it in your 22d page, that you have something to hope for from those whose cause you espouse; for can any one in his senses suppose that a man of your influence, taking part with administration, shall lose his reward? * It is well

* I am informed that when Mr. John Wesley came to town, previous to the publishing his Address, he told the society, that he had had the honour of a visit from two of his Majesty's ministers of state.

well known, that the m——y patronize men of corrupt principles, and evil practices, to scribble in support of their destructive measures, because better men refuse such dirty work. Can it be thought then, that they will not take especial notice of Mr. John Wesley, who boldly stands forth in the defence of their cause, with the specious epithets of learned, good, pious, &c. Especially, Sir, as your religious principles, which are a species of Popery, do exactly fall in with a late act of parliament, which establishes the destructive doctrines of Papalism in so vast a country as Canada. I therefore think, Sir, you have something to hope for: Nor should I wonder, if thy venerable hoary head should be adorned with a mitre, though, for my part, I must confess, that I really believe it would much better become thee to sit in sack-cloth, and pour dust upon thy head, and earnestly

earnestly cry for mercy; seeing thou hast added to all thine iniquities, that of publishing an Address to thy brethren in America, in which thou consentest unto, and dost thereby become a partaker of the sins of wicked and ungodly men, who are seeking to dissolve our once happy constitution, by inculcating and enforcing the detestable doctrines of passive obedience and non-resistance, which, if men submit to, their lives, liberties and properties are no longer their own; and this, it is to be feared, thou hast not done in the integrity of thine heart, but with a view to ecclesiastical promotion; by which I perceive, thou art still in the gall of bitterness, and in the bond of iniquity; and I think you would do well to pray to God, that the thought of thine heart may be forgiven thee, lest thy grey hairs come down with sorrow to the grave.

I am

I am a stranger to you, Sir, but you are not so to me, and from what little I know of you, I have hitherto found you a very erroneous inconsistent man, both in preaching and writing, of which I could produce many instances, but as I do not mean to wander from my present subject, I shall only refer to that Address to which this is designed as a Reply, in which the matter is so partially stated, many things so inconsistent, and ipse-dixits put in the room of argument, that, instead of its being received with applause, as I hear it is by many, it is, in my humble opinion, deserving of the highest censure. — In this Reply I shall be as short as the nature of the subject will admit; and that I may not be charged with partiality, I shall not leave any part of your Address unnoticed.

You

You begin with telling your brethren and countrymen, that the grand question, viz. Whether the English Parliament has power to tax the American Colonies is now debated with warmth enough on both sides. Surely, Sir, if you thought the question worthy of debate, you would not censure men for zealously maintaining that which in their consciences they think right : If you think, it is not worthy of debate, or will not admit of it, I presume you would have acted wisely, and far more consistently, had you saved yourself the trouble of given us your sentiments upon it; but it seems you have thought proper so to do; and in answer to the question, you say, “ In order to determine this, let us consider “ the nature of our colonies ;” and then you give us the description of an English Colony, with this inference, “ Nothing can be more plain, than that the
supreme

supreme power in England has a legal right of laying any tax upon them for any end beneficial to the whole empire."

Now, Sir, admitting this description and inference to be just, as at first sight it appears, I would ask you, as you are doubtless well acquainted with our excellent constitution, whether or not, there is provision made against any wanton exercise of that power, which you call supreme? If so, it supposes that such power may exercise such right illegally and unconstitutionally; and therefore not to be submitted to by Englishmen, who enjoy their liberty upon the same footing that a king of England does his crown; and a man may as well say, that our king has a legal right to be as arbitrary as the kings of France and Spain, as to say, that the legislative power of this realm has a legal right to bind the Americans in all cases whatsoever. Could it indeed be proved,
that

that the end of laying on of taxes of any kind was for the benefit of the whole empire, as you very plausibly suggest, then it would appear feasible; but is not America a part of the empire? How then can laying an additional burden upon them, who have been, ever since they first settled as a Colony, under such restrictions, as have been very prejudicial to their interests, be for the good of the whole empire? But you will perhaps say, it will be for the good of the whole, because it would be a means of removing some of the burdens we labour under, and the support of government would be more equally maintained: I wish that could be proved, it might be productive of very happy effects; but it is notorious, that the laying on of taxes on the Americans is not designed for the benefit, but for the destruction of the whole empire; as the money, raised by taxes,

is

is shamefully lavished upon placemen and pensioners, bribery and corruption, to the obtaining a venial H—— of C——s; and I am sorry to say, the infection is too visible in the H—— of L——s, B——s not excepted, by which means the M——y, being sure of a majority, frame and bring into the House what bills they please, though ever so contrary to the constitution, have them passed into a law, and resist who dare. By these things it is that our constitution is not what it was sixteen years ago, but altered by men, who, upon its original plan, in pursuance of their present measures, could not exist as ministers of state.

I am fully persuaded, that if the monies arising from the multiplicity of taxes, charged upon the inhabitants of Great-Britain, were properly applied, and justly accounted for, there would be

more

more than sufficient for the support of government, and the exigencies of state; especially in a time of fifteen years profound peace; but if unnecessary pensioners and placemen are to be kept, and the number of them daily to increase; if a publick paymaster is allowed to squander away millions of the publick money, without accounting for it, then no wonder that fresh taxes are levied; and because England cannot well sustain the weight of more than it at present bears, they should have recourse to America. Can it be possible, Sir, that you can conceive that such proceedings are of benefit to the whole empire? Surely not; and therefore, though it may be legal to levy taxes for the benefitting of the whole empire, it is not legal to do any thing that shall be destructive in the present time to a part, and eventually to the whole of that empire.

But

But you go on, in answer to what the Americans plead as freemen and Englishmen having a right to be taxed by their own consent, which they cannot be, because they are not represented; and say, " This argument proves too much; for if the Parliament cannot tax you because you are not represented, neither can it for the same reason make laws to bind you," &c. But however, the whole scope of your argument here does not prove what you assert, no more than if you had said, because men willingly and chearfully submit to laws absolutely necessary for the preservation of civil society, that they thereby must subject themselves to whatever depredations on their property the legislative authority may think proper to make.

But you say, " You object to the very foundation of their plea; because it is

B

absolutely

absolutely false that every freeman is governed by laws to which he has consented;" your reason for this assertion is, "That all publick business is done by delegation, and the delegates are chosen by a select number, and the far greater part stand by idle and helpless spectators;" and you farther say, that such must be governed not only without but even against their consent. Need I remind you, Sir, that originally delegates were not chosen by a few of the people, as they are now, but all had a liberty of choice, and a right to vote; but not to mention that some unjust means have been used to deprive men of their natural right in this respect, it became necessary, in a great measure, as the number of the inhabitants increased, to circumscribe the number of electors, to prevent unnecessary trouble, and endless confusion, which it would inevitably create,

create, were our delegates chosen in that manner at this day: And if you consider, that the delegates, taxing their electors, do by the same act tax themselves, it will in a great measure set aside that absurd notion of men being taxed without, much less against their consent; for if these delegates make laws, which are as binding upon themselves as they are upon their electors, what ground is there for complaint? It lies not in unequal representation, but in having so many Court-Dependents in the House, who care not how many taxes are laid upon them, while they are supplied with a salary more than equivalent to answer such demands, which they would not have were they not the servants of a corrupt M — y; and thus the burden lies heavy upon the people: But the case is very different respecting America, for as they have no representatives

belonging to themselves in the British Parliament, if the British Parliament, who are not Americans, are invested with a power of disposing other peoples property, without in the least affecting their own, what must be the consequence? It is fairly this, that for want of affection to, being ignorant of their state, by reason of their distance, or seeing things through false meditations, as well as looking to the advantages that may arise to themselves, as expectants of court favour, they will be disposed to deal with them more like slaves than fellow subjects.

And what you suggest, respecting mens consenting to laws made before they were born, is equally as futile, unless you can prove that their predecessors were slaves, and under the iron hand of arbitrary power; but as those
who

who made these laws were freemen, the laws made by them were such as all freemen may consent to; and therefore why should you call this a passive consent? Unless you mean to cast an odium upon our once happy constitution, or to prove, if men are passively subject in one case they must in another.

You say also, "That any other than this kind of consent, the condition of civil life does not allow." You seem very fond, Sir, of the idea of slavery. I consent to the laws of England because they are good; I approve of them, and prefer them above any human laws, and will you call this a passive consent? Or, will you say, that the conditions of civil life does not allow of such a consent as this? Perhaps you will tell me such a consent as this includes the passive: I grant it, but I think it is very necessary

to make a distinction between freemen and slaves.

You next proceed to make some remarks on an assertion of the Americans, viz. " That they are entitled to life, liberty and property by nature, and have never ceded to any sovereign power the right of disposing of these without their consent," which you say, " While they speak as the naked sons of nature is true;" but they presently declare, our ancestors, at the time they settled these colonies, were entitled to all the privileges of natural-born subjects; " this likewise, you say, is true; but when this is granted, the boast of original right is at an end, you are no longer in a state of nature, but sink down into colonists." I am sure, Sir, if you had any modesty, you must sink down with shame, for making such an assertion; you know better,

better, Sir, than to suppose that the Americans are contending for the right of civil laws, whereby every man has by nature a right to an equal share of what we call property, but they are contending for the rights of Englishmen, and for those liberties, many of which were purchased with the blood of their forefathers; and is therefore now become their natural right, that which they are born to, and that which the legislative power cannot deprive them of, without striking at the very existence of a free state; and though you tell them, with a sneer, " They sink down into colonists, governed by charter," let me tell you, Sir, that the charter granted to such, not only maintains that which is their natural right, but contains a grant of some special advantages and privileges, as a kind of stimulation (instead of permission as you call it in your first out-set) to those who
are

are willing thus to settle; for there is no law in being that could force them to leave their native land, and retire to a desert place, unless you can prove they were originally transported as felons, and therefore “shame burn thy cheek to cinder.” Now then, their ancestors were subjects, not slaves; they acknowledged a sovereign, not absolute; they were intitled to English liberties, equally, and on some account more than their fellow subjects; they were accountable to the English laws, if found guilty of the breach of them, but it does not follow from hence, that they have ceded to the king and parliament the power of disposing, without their consent, of both their lives, liberties and properties. I should rather think, as it seems most consistent with common-sense, that the king and parliament did cede to them (not a dispensation from obedience, nor any degree of

of independence, not enjoyed by other Englishmen) but certain privileges and immunities by charter, upon condition of colonization,

I find in the next place, you are obliged to make some concession, respecting their not having forfeited any of their privileges by emigration, though it seems to go against the grain; for you say, "what they do not forfeit by a judicial sentence, they may lose by natural effects;" and this you attempt to prove, by a method of reasoning entirely new; that because a man, by removing to a certain distance from his native land, where he cannot exercise his right, does therefore necessarily lose it; but what has this to do with the present question? Does a man, who is legally qualified to vote, but by reason of distance cannot exercise his right, lose his privileges as an Englishman,

Englishman, or even his vote? This argument therefore is too far fetched to be of any use to you; besides, Sir, Ireland might be said to come under much the same predicament, had it not a parliament of its own; and pray, have not the Americans as much right to a parliament as Ireland? I think equally, if not more so; because the people of Ireland might be represented in the British parliament, with far greater ease than the Americans possible can, by reason of their distance.

You go on seemingly to make another concession, and say, "They do inherit all the privileges their ancestors had." This, Sir, is false; for they do not inherit all their ancestors had, nor so much, by a great deal; their privileges have been sadly abridged within these ten years: Will any man, who has heard of the
many

many oppressive acts of parliament which have passed, in order to reduce them to slavery and bondage, say, they inherit all their ancestors did? They indeed inherit the same noble spirit; and though you say "they can inherit no more," yet it is more than possible, that they will, to the mortification of their enemies, enjoy greater privileges than their ancestors, if ever they should be independent of the crown of England, and, by a more equal representation, make laws for themselves.

In the next place, as you cannot disprove, that the colonists have no right to all the privileges granted by the crown; yet you say, there is a doubt whether any can be secured by provincial laws. I am very glad it is a matter of doubt, and that you seem to admit it, but by your reasons against it, I should suppose

pose it was a matter which you firmly believed ; but I humbly apprehend, it may with propriety be said, that the provincial laws secure the privileges of the colonies, in the same manner as an act of common council in the city of London is a law which secures the privileges of citizens from the invasion of foreigners ; and is of as much force in the city as an act of parliament is in the realm, provided such act of common council is not contrary to the charters granted by the crown.

But I proceed now to consider, what you say concerning the charter of Pennsylvania, as containing a clause, admitting, in express terms, taxation by parliament, and if not inserted in the other charters, you say, “ it is admitted as not necessary ; this proves too much,” because upon your own hypothesis there

was no occasion to insert it in any one of the charters. You very sophistically tell them, " It is true the first settlers in " Massachusset's-Bay were promised an " exemption from taxation for seven " years ; but does not this very exemp- " tion imply that they were to pay them " afterwards ? " Admitting it does, what is that to the present purpose ? They do not contend that they have no right to pay taxes, but not to be taxed by the British Parliament in what way and manner they shall think proper, but let them tax themselves.

Again, you say, " If there is in the charter of any colony a clause exempting them from taxes for ever, then undoubtedly they have a right to be so exempted ; but if there is no such clause, then the
Parliament

Parliament has the same right to tax them as any other English subjects :” But why this conclusion, Sir? if you could prove that there is a charter in which there is a clause which subjects them to taxation by the British Parliament, without representation, then your inference would have been just, though the thing itself might be unjust; and indeed the thing itself would not be unjust, had the colonists accepted such charter, on such conditions, but they have not; and therefore the English Parliament have not that authority over them, which you would have them believe.

After this comes a very bold stroke of yours, wherein you say, “ All that impartially consider what has been observed, must

must readily allow that the English Parliament has an undoubted right to tax all English colonies :” Sir, I deny it; and perhaps I have been as impartial in considering what you have observed, as you have in your observations, if not more so; as I have proved you have something to hope for, as a reward for your labour, therefore think you may be biased; but I cannot, in the very nature of things, be supposed to be under any such baneful influence; I may rather expect loss than gain by it. Nevertheless, Sir, I say, the English Parliament has not a legal right to tax the colonists, it being contrary to the English constitution for English subjects to be taxed, but by themselves, or men delegated for that purpose.

Having gone on thus far, you begin to upbraid them with that for which you ought rather to pity them; you ask, " Whence is all this hurry, why is America all in an uproar? if they would give themselves time to think, they would see the plain case is this," which you go on to relate.— Does Mr. Wesley need to be informed, that this is a very unfair, uncandid representation of the case? It is well known, that the motive, that induced us to assist our brethren, was not so much out of affection for them, as to prevent the common enemy from gaining ground, lest they should have the balance of power in America, which would have been very detrimental to England. It is also well known, that most of the conquests gained in America were owing to the valour of the Provincials; and do not every body know,

except

except Mr. Wesley, that with respect to raising money to carry on the war, they did more than could be expected from them; in consideration of which, the then English Parliament voted, several times, by request of the king, two hundred thousand pounds, to be repaid them, as an acknowledgment of their services. And will you be so ridiculous as to talk of the Mother Country, "laying on a tax, to be reimbursed for part of the large expence she had been at? And will you call this legal, or reasonable? Fy, Mr. Wesley, fy; throw away your pen, unless you can employ it in a better cause: No wonder then, that such a proceeding should set all America in a flame.

But you think you have a reason, far more cogent, no doubt, than any that

has yet been offered, “ which you tell us freely ;” and after asserting a falshood, which I have noted before, you say, “ We have a few men in England,” &c. Indeed Sir, in this I am of your mind ; there a few men in England, tories and jacobites, friends to the Pope and Pretender, who hate his Majesty, and are, by a variety of means, endeavouring, and seem determined to overturn the constitution, and lay the crown and dignity of England level with the earth, by opposing, under various pretences, all measures of accommodation with America, from a conviction, I presume, that while there is a good understanding between America and Britain, she is not likely to be ruined ; but as you have not pointed particularly to these men, I will : They are his M——y’s M——s, and a corrupt P——t, who, we see, as a farther
proof

proof of the end they have in view, give countenance to flattering fulsome Addresses, that are calculated to deceive the king; and suppress all that is in their power, every request of his Majesty's most faithful subjects, who wish for conciliating measures, and represent things as they really are.

You say, "These good men (by which, as I would hope the best, I suppose you intend an irony) hope it will end in the total defection of America from England." Whatever these good men may hope, I know not, but I am sure they are going the direct way to accomplish such an end.

As you go on, you put many queries respecting their civil and religious liberties, "That they have no cause to complain,

complain, and that should it be as these good men hope, what advantage will it be to them? &c." To all which, Sir, I would reply, there is great cause of complaint, inasmuch as their civil liberties are struck at; and when once their civil liberties are gone, farewell to their religious ones; but they do not want to be independent of England, though perhaps these good men, by these good measures, may make them so; and then you may thank the ministry for it.

You conclude all with a word of exhortation, and that in your usual manner, "Brethren open your eyes;" Alas! Sir, they see too plainly already. "Come to yourselves:" No; you cannot mean so; you mean, come into the measures of Parliament; submit to the yoke of taxation. "Be not the dupes of designing men;" this
they

they are not willing to be, and that is the reason of their present conduct: Your exhortation therefore, in every part of it, is incompatible with the state and conduct of the persons to whom it is given. But by these designing men, you say, " You do not mean any of their country; you doubt whether any of them are in the secret." If, Sir, you had excepted a few, such as the H——s, the G——s, the D——s, &c. I should really agree with you; for I believe the principal men, who are enemies to America, are on this side the water, and rather too near his M——s Person.

Now, Sir, to conclude, I shall only say, that the remainder of your harangue, which you conclude thus, " Fear God, and honour the King," favours more of religious cant, than any sincere wish for the welfare of America.

F I N I S.

HOST



TO APPEAR
FUNCTION

